

1 Robyn E. Bladow (SBN 205189)  
2 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
3 555 South Flower Street  
4 Suite 3700  
5 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
6 Telephone: (213) 680-8400  
7 Facsimile: (213) 680-8500  
8 Robyn.Bladow@kirkland.com

9 Jay P. Lefkowitz, P.C. (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
10 Joey Resnick (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
11 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
12 601 Lexington Avenue  
13 New York, NY 10022  
14 Telephone: (212) 446-4800  
15 lefkowitz@kirkland.com  
16 joey.resnick@kirkland.com

17 *Counsel for Defendant*

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
19 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 JOSHUA CROSS, individually and on  
21 behalf of all others similarly situated,

22 Plaintiff,

23 vs.

24 HALEON US HOLDINGS LLC,

25 Defendant.

26 } CASE NO. 2:24-CV-09325-MCS-PVC

27 } **DEFENDANT'S NOTICE OF**  
28 } **MOTION AND MOTION TO**  
29 } **DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S**  
30 } **AMENDED COMPLAINT**

31 } Complaint Filed: October 29, 2024  
32 } Judge: Hon. Mark C. Scarsi  
33 } Hearing Date: March 3, 2025  
34 } Time: 9:00 a.m.  
35 } Courtroom: 7C

1 **TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

2 **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT** on Monday, March 3, 2025 at 9:00 a.m., or as  
3 soon thereafter as this matter may be heard in Courtroom 7C of the above captioned  
4 Court, located at 350 West 1<sup>st</sup> Street, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, California 90012, Defendant  
5 Haleon US Holdings LLC, will and hereby does move pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil  
6 Procedure 12(b)(6) for an Order dismissing with prejudice the Amended Complaint filed  
7 by Joshua Cross (Plaintiff) based on the following grounds:

8 1. Federal law preempts Plaintiff's state-law claims because they seek to impose  
9 requirements different from, in addition to, or otherwise not identical with an applicable  
10 FDA monograph. The Antigingivitis Monograph deals squarely with the Parodontax  
11 product and its active ingredient, and Plaintiff's state-law claims seeking to "prohibit[]  
12 labeling that is not prohibited under federal law" are expressly preempted by Section 379r.  
13 *Wiltz v. Chattem, Inc.*, 2015 WL 3862368, at \*1 (C.D. Cal. May 8, 2015).

14 2. No reasonable consumer would be misled by the Parodontax label. Plaintiff  
15 challenges one product claim that the label does not even make, and another that he admits  
16 is true. False advertising claims cannot rely on "unreasonable or fanciful interpretations of  
17 labels." *Moore v. Trader Joe's Co.*, 4 F.4th 874, 882-83 (9th Cir. 2021). Where—as here—  
18 claims fail "to establish how the label is false or misleading when read as a whole," *Steiner*  
19 *v. Vi-Jon Inc.*, 2024 WL 1181002, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2024), dismissal is warranted.

20 3. Plaintiff's unjust enrichment claim is legally deficient for at least two  
21 additional reasons. First, in California, "[t]here is no cause of action for unjust enrichment."  
22 *Clancy v. Bromley Tea Co.*, 308 F.R.D. 564, 576 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2013) (quoting *Myers-*  
23 *Armstrong v. Actavis Totowa, LLC*, 382 Fed. Appx. 545, 548 (9th Cir. 2010)). Second,  
24 unjust enrichment is unavailable to Plaintiff because it is an equitable claim, and the  
25 Amended Complaint fails to plead that there is no adequate remedy at law. *See In re*  
26 *Samsung Galaxy Smartphone Mktg. & Sales Pracs. Litig.*, 2020 WL 7664461, at \*12 (N.D.  
27 Cal. Dec. 24, 2020).

1       4. Plaintiff's implied warranty claim fails for at least two additional reasons.  
2 First, "privity of contract is required to sustain an implied warranty claim in California."  
3 *Paramount Farms Int'l LLC v. Ventilex B.V.*, 500 Fed. Appx. 586, 588 (9th Cir. 2012).  
4 Here, there is no such privity. Second, the implied warranty of merchantability requires  
5 only a "minimum level of quality." *Birdsong v. Apple, Inc.*, 590 F.3d 955, 958 (9th Cir.  
6 2009). Plaintiff does not and cannot allege that Parodontax lacks minimal quality.

7       This Motion is based on the Memorandum of Points and Authorities, and on such  
8 oral argument and evidence that the Court may consider at the hearing. This Motion is  
9 made following the conference of counsel pursuant to L.R. 7-3, which took place on  
10 November 14, 2024; November 27, 2024; and December 30, 2024.

11  
12  
13      Dated: January 3, 2025

**KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP**

14  
15      By: /s/ Robyn E. Bladow  
16           Robyn E. Bladow (SBN 205189)  
17           KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
18           555 South Flower Street  
19           Suite 3700  
20           Los Angeles, CA 90071  
21           Telephone: (213) 680-8400  
22           Facsimile: (213) 680-8500  
23           Robyn.Bladow@kirkland.com

24  
25      Jay P. Lefkowitz, P.C. (*pro hac vice*  
26           forthcoming)  
27           Joey Resnick (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
28           KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
29           601 Lexington Avenue  
30           New York, NY 10022  
31           Telephone: (212) 446-4800  
32           lefkowitz@kirkland.com  
33           joey.resnick@kirkland.com

34  
35      *Counsel for Defendant*

## **SIGNATURE CERTIFICATION**

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-4.3.4, I hereby attest that all the other signatories listed and on whose behalf the filing is submitted, concur in the filing's content and have authorized this filing.

Dated: January 3, 2025

/s/ *Robyn E. Bladow*

---

Robyn E. Bladow

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
2  
3  
4

5 I hereby certify that on January 3, 2025 the within document was filed with the  
6 Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF which will send notification of such filing to the  
7 attorneys of record in this case.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

10 */s/ Robyn E. Bladow*  
11 Robyn E. Bladow  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28